

**SR 161 Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2  
Eatonville Elementary School Library – May 8, 2003  
Meeting Summary**

**Attendees:**

Mike Williams	Barb Lemay	Rick Adams
Tanya Dow	Bobbi Allison	Jill Hawk
Steve Lind	Silvia R Hefley	Vicki Biscay
Mark Kask	Harold Hefley	Jesse Hamashima
Phillip Beach	Bryan Bowden	Sandi Anderson
Jim Halmo	Sylvia Cleaver	Gayle Adams

**Staff:**

John Donahue  
Vicki Steigner  
Katie Hesterberg

**Introductions:**

The meeting began promptly at 6:00 pm. John Donahue asked the meeting attendees to introduce themselves and state their interest or organization represented. Then the staff members were introduced.

**Notebooks:**

Each committee member present received a “Stakeholder Committee Notebook,” which is a 3-ring binder with dividers and tabs corresponding to each of the seven planned stakeholder meetings and each of the three planned public meetings regarding the Route Development Plan for SR 161. The sections for Stakeholder Meetings 1 and 2, and Public Meeting 1 already contain information, and the remaining sections are empty and can be filled with handouts to be received at upcoming meetings.

**Ground Rules:**

Vicki Steigner led the committee in establishing ground rules to be used at this meeting and the remaining meetings. She presented a draft of 4 ground rules to the committee. The committee adopted the rules, as drafted, with a majority thumbs up, one thumb across, and no thumbs down vote. See the attached “Ground Rules.”

**Route Issues Results:**

John Donahue summarized the results from the survey filled out at Stakeholder Meeting 1 and the Public Meetings #1. The results were also included in the notebooks. Issues polled in the survey include the regional and community function of the route. The results of the survey indicate significant correlation between Eatonville and Graham: the two communities have many of the same concerns. Issues relating to safety and congestion came up the most on the surveys. Two apparent differences between the communities are the interest in tourist issues in Eatonville and the interest in traffic capacity and congestion in Graham.

John presented results of the “Likes and Dislikes” exercise conducted at Stakeholder meeting 1 and Public Meetings #1. A detailed account of the exercise and results was also distributed as part of the committee notebooks. A pie chart, included in the notebooks, shows the most significant likes and dislikes. Safety and mobility appear to be of greatest concern on the route. John presented another pie chart that demonstrated the



percentage of each group (Graham, Eatonville, or stakeholders) most concerned with each of those 2 issues. While the chart indicated that Graham is most concerned with safety, John pointed out that a fatality car crash occurred nearby just before the Graham Public Meeting 1. The results also indicate that the stakeholder group appears to focus on mobility more than the two communities did.

**Draft Vision Statement, brainstorm goals and objectives:**

Vicki Steigner explained the purpose of a “Vision Statement” and provided an example. The committee broke into groups of 3 and developed draft vision statements for the RDP. The committee used common themes and phrases from this work to build the following vision statement:

**“SR 161, the backbone of a safe, efficient and pleasant transportation system, promotes a diverse system of mobility, preserves the integrity of the rural landscape and serves the needs of our community and visitors.”**

The committee adopted it with a majority thumbs up and one thumb across, One person abstained from voting.

Then Vicki explained that goals and objectives are the practical issues that must be addressed to make the vision possible. Four goals were identified from the vision statement. Then the committee brainstormed objectives to support these goals; see attachment for the goals and objectives, as recorded.

A packet containing the vision and goals of the Graham and Eatonville communities was handed out after the exercise. As homework, the committee members were asked to review it and check for conflicts with the vision, goals and objectives they wrote for SR 161. The goals and objectives will be reviewed and adopted at the next stakeholder meeting.

**Action Items:**

John Donahue answered questions about the Jurisdiction Transfer Process that were raised at the previous meeting. He offered to invite Stevan Gorcester from the Transportation Improvement Board to the next stakeholder meeting to discuss the process in more detail. The Clear Lake paving project schedule for 161 was also addressed and a flyer was included in the notebook.

**Schedule:**

The committee agreed to meet again on June 10<sup>th</sup> from 6 to 8 pm at the Eatonville Elementary School Library. June 24<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> were discussed as possible dates for the upcoming Public Meetings #2.